

Republicans do not favor a one-size-fits-all universal health care system. We understand what a one-size-fits-all system does. We know that that would mean universally poor care that leaves consumers basically with no power and no rights in the management of their own health coverage and their own health decisions.

Outside the Beltway, people are excited about Health Savings Accounts, personal health accounts. This editorial from the *National Business Journal* is titled "Health Savings Plans Can Help Business." This recognizes that small businesses will be able to offer health care to employees in a way that reduces paperwork and empowers the employee. As the editorial states: "This is part of an ownership society," something that we are hearing the President talk about daily. An ownership society. What this means is more health care coverage, more options, more power for consumers in those personal health accounts, and we think that that is a very good idea.

In another article that I have, this time from the *Memphis Business Journal*, the other end of my district, it has said that the new health care items, this is what is "getting the enthusiasm," is the health savings accounts. And why? Because they function like a health care IRA, giving consumers ownership over a tax-free account. What a great idea.

Mr. Speaker, regardless of what Candidate KERRY and the liberal left would tell us, it is clear that Americans are increasingly aware of what President Bush and the Congress have done to reinvigorate our economy, to expand health care options, and to win the war on terror. Faced with the horrific attacks on America, a trillion dollar hit to our economy, and a preexisting recession, the Bush administration and this Republican Congress have made significant strides in the right direction. And that is something we are looking forward to continuing in the year ahead.

SMART SECURITY AND IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, as thousands of our brave American soldiers continue to fight and die and receive serious wounds halfway around the world, I want to speak about two Iraqs that are presented to the American people.

There is the Iraq that President Bush and his administration want people to see, the one that is supposedly one small step away from becoming a peaceful democracy. And then there is the real Iraq, the quagmire halfway around the world that the rest of us know.

In President Bush's Iraq, the war was never a mistake, never a failure, and never something to question, much less

regret. The same war, which as of today has caused the deaths of 1,027 American soldiers and seriously wounded at least seven times that many, not to mention the thousands of Iraqi civilians that have been killed, President Bush says he would have gone to war in Iraq even if had he known 2 years ago what he knows now.

That means he would have gone to war knowing that Iraq did not have a nuclear weapons program. He would have gone to war knowing that Saddam Hussein never harbored al Qaeda terrorists, and he would have gone to war knowing that thousands of our young soldiers would be killed. Somehow, and I do not know how, somehow President Bush fails to recognize the death, destruction, and deprivation that his war has caused.

The rest of us see a different Iraq than President Bush. In the real Iraq, America preemptively waged a war that was never a war of necessity and never a war to protect our Nation. Instead, President Bush and the Republican-controlled Congress led this country into a war that U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan recently called "illegal."

In the real Iraq, hundreds of soldiers have died because they were not given the battle armor that would have stopped bullets from entering their bodies, even after Congress made funds available for that very specific purpose. This was a drastic mistake made by the Pentagon.

In the real Iraq, President Bush, as Commander in Chief, has failed to properly address the insurgency that is killing scores of troops and civilians every day. This is a failure that could have and should have been addressed during the planning stages of the war.

In the past week, four Republican Senators have bucked their party line and acknowledged the sweeping problems that exist in the real Iraq. Senator CHUCK HAGEL of Nebraska said, "I don't think we're winning . . . we're in trouble. We're in deep trouble."

Senator RICHARD LUGAR, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, went further. When asked why only \$1 billion of the \$18 billion appropriated for Iraq's reconstruction has been spent, he said, "Well, this is the incompetence of the administration."

This did not have to be an unmitigated disaster. But Iraq is woefully unstable largely due to planning failures by the Bush administration: the failure to enlist most of our allies as partners in the war, the failure to anticipate the anger and intensity of the insurgency, and the failure to allocate the billions of dollars in reconstruction funds that could have helped secure that country.

Fortunately, we have opportunities to fix this awful mess. Earlier this week Senator JOHN KERRY offered a better, smarter solution to fixing the real problems in Iraq. JOHN KERRY's plan includes soliciting and enlisting support from our allies, properly training Iraq's security forces, and carrying

out a viable reconstruction plan that truly involves the Iraqi people, instead of giving companies like Halliburton the benefit of America's investment, while leaving Iraqi companies without contracts and the Iraqi people without jobs.

We need to engage in smarter policies if we want to stop the bleeding in Iraq. That is why I have introduced H. Con. Res. 392, to create a smarter security resolution for the 21st century. SMART stands for Sensible, Multilateral American Response to Terrorism. With SMART security, we would not be in the mess that we are in today. SMART security treats war as an absolute last resort. It fights terrorism with stronger intelligence and multilateral partnerships, and it controls the spread of weapons of mass destruction with aggressive diplomacy, strong regional security arrangements, and vigorous inspection regimes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the *Extensions of Remarks*.)

EXPRESSING OUTRAGE AT REPUBLICAN DOUBLE STANDARD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EMANUEL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMANUEL. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is talking about Dan Rather, CBS, and the false National Guard memos. Republicans are saying that he misled the Nation, that it is a scandal that threatens our body politic. Congressional Republicans are talking about an ethics investigation. And yesterday on a radio show, Bill Bennett said the Dan Rather incident went beyond bias. He said, "This is corruption."

Let me tell the Members something. Dan Rather is going to get a whopping, and he deserves it. CBS has a black eye, and they earned it. There is no excuse for what happened. However, all this outrage from the self-righteous right wing of this country has taken hypocrisy to a new low.

Let me ask my colleagues where was the moral outrage and where is the moral outrage when the President of the United States here in the State of the Union at this podium used falsified evidence to allege in his State of the Union that Iraq had attempted to purchase yellow cake uranium from Nigeria?

□ 2015

Where is their moral outrage when Condoleezza Rice and DICK CHENEY repeatedly link Saddam Hussein and al Qaeda, all the while knowing that no evidence supports the claim?

Where is their moral outrage when our President said we would find tens